

Comment on ‘Renormalization-Group Calculation of the Dependence on Gravity of the Surface Tension and Bending Rigidity of a Fluid Interface’

In a recent Letter [1] a renormalization-group (RG) calculation of the gravity dependence of properties of a liquid-vapor interface is presented whose central point is the use of the (bare) capillary-wave-like Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H}_{CW}[\zeta] = \int d^{d-1}R \left[\frac{\gamma_0}{2} |\nabla \zeta|^2 + \frac{a_0(g)}{2} \zeta^2 + \frac{\lambda}{4!} \zeta^4 \right] \quad (1)$$

to study the interface in the limit of vanishing gravitational acceleration g . Here $\zeta(\vec{R})$ is the local height of the interface configuration $[\zeta]$ at position $\vec{R}$ relative to the plane $z = 0$. Recognizing that (1) is just the usual φ^4 Hamiltonian and that $a_0(g)$ vanishes as $g \rightarrow 0$, the authors followed the standard RG analysis for the critical *Ising* system, arrived at the fixed point Hamiltonian

$$\int d^{d-1}R \left[\frac{1}{2} |\nabla \zeta|^2 + \frac{\lambda^*}{4!} \zeta^4 \right], \quad (2)$$

and reached a remarkable conclusion: interfacial properties (in d dimensions) for $g = 0$ should be identical to those in a critical, $d - 1$ dimensional bulk *Ising* system.

In order for this analysis and its conclusions to be valid, the (renormalized) coupling constant λ *must remain positive* in this limit, i.e., $\lim_{g \rightarrow 0} \lambda(g) = \lambda^{(0)} > 0$. However, in the present interface case (in contrast to that of critical bulk systems), there are fundamental symmetry requirements that enforce $\lambda^{(0)} = 0$. We believe that the authors’ introduction of a nontrivial $\lambda(g)$ is justifiable. But as we shall show in the sequel, their assumption of $\lambda^{(0)} > 0$ is untenable, so that their subsequent analysis is irrelevant and the conclusion unreliable.

Consider a simple liquid-vapor system in d dimensions, under the influence of a potential gz . Let $(x_i) = (R_\alpha, x_d \equiv z) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be the coordinates of a point relative to a fixed frame with Euclidean unit vectors $\vec{e}_i$. In the *absence* of gravity, the system respects the Euclidean symmetries and hence is invariant under translations and rotations $x_i \rightarrow x'_i = \mathcal{R}_{ij} x_j - A_i$, where $(\mathcal{R}_{ij})$ is a rotation matrix. In the two-phase region (of the $g = 0$ system), these symmetries are broken spontaneously by the presence of an interface, so that *nonlinear* realizations of the Euclidean group are necessary. For $g \neq 0$, these symmetries are broken explicitly. Under a rotation, the system transforms into one with a rotated field: $g \vec{e}_d \rightarrow \mathcal{R}_{id} g \vec{e}_i$.

Let us write possible (bare) interface Hamiltonians as

$$\mathcal{H}^{(g)}[\zeta] = \int d^{d-1}R \mathcal{L}^{(g)}(\zeta, \partial \zeta, \partial^2 \zeta, \dots), \quad (3)$$

where $\partial \zeta, \partial^2 \zeta, \dots$ stand for first, second, and higher partial derivatives $\partial \zeta / \partial R_\alpha$ etc. $\mathcal{H}^{(0)}[\zeta]$ *must be invariant* under the transformations discussed above. We consider separately the consequences of this trivial observation.

(i) *Translations along the z axis:* This symmetry is realized by $\zeta \rightarrow \zeta' = \zeta - A_d$. The invariance of $\mathcal{H}^{(0)}$ means that the energy cost of such a translation vanishes as $g \rightarrow 0$. Hence $\mathcal{L}^{(0)}$ cannot depend explicitly on ζ : we must have $\mathcal{L}^{(g)} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}^{(0)}(\partial \zeta, \partial^2 \zeta, \dots)$. This rules out terms like $\lambda \zeta^4$, as well as (2), in the limit $g \rightarrow 0$. Yet, $\lambda^{(0)} > 0$ is crucial for the approach in [1], the presence of an upper critical dimension of 5, and the fixed point (2).

(ii) *Rotations about $\vec{e}_\alpha$:* As discussed in Ref. [2], $\mathcal{H}^{(0)}$ must realize this symmetry in a nonlinear fashion. Specifically, if only first derivatives $\partial \zeta$ are taken into account, then $\mathcal{H}^{(0)}$ is simply proportional to the surface area, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{L}^{(0)}(\partial \zeta, 0, \dots) = \sigma \sqrt{\eta}, \quad (4)$$

where $\eta = 1 + (\partial_\alpha \zeta)^2$ is the determinant of the induced metric. In fact, this ‘drumhead’ model can be derived directly from appropriate bulk models of the φ^4 type in the low-temperature limit [3]. Corrections to it depending on derivatives of higher than first order can be derived in a systematic fashion [4,5]; the leading ones involve the trace of the curvature tensor and the curvature scalar.

Starting from a φ^4 model for the *bulk*, the parameters a_0 and λ could be computed by an appropriate generalization of the analysis of Refs. [3] and [4] to the case $g \neq 0$. That these parameters vanish for $g = 0$ has been shown already in these references.

In summary, the interface model of Ref. [1], while valid for $g \neq 0$, violates fundamental symmetry requirements for $g = 0$. Thus its results cannot be applied to critical properties of interfaces in vanishing gravitational fields.

One of us (H.W.D.) is indebted to S. Dietrich for calling his attention to Ref. [1].

H. W. Diehl, Fachbereich Physik, Universität Essen, D-45117 Essen, Germany

R. K. P. Zia, Department of Physics, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia 24601, USA

-
- [1] J. G. Segovia-López and V. Romero-Rochín, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 2369 (2001).
 - [2] D. J. Wallace and R. K. P. Zia, Phys. Rev. Lett. **43**, 808 (1979).
 - [3] H. W. Diehl, D. M. Kroll, and H. Wagner, Z. Phys. B **36**, 329 (1980).
 - [4] R. K. P. Zia, Nucl. Phys. B **251** [FS13], 676 (1985).
 - [5] S. C. Lin and M. J. Low, J. Phys. A **16**, 347 (1983).